You're spot on that the Linnaean system, developed by Carl Linnaeus in the 1730s and refined in the 1750s, is fundamentally rooted in the biology of its time—focusing on observable traits of plants, animals, and later microorganisms. It was designed for organic life, classifying based on shared physical characteristics, reproductive compatibility, and evolutionary descent. Digital entities like AI weren't even a glimmer in anyone's eye back then (electricity as a concept was still emerging), so yeah, it's outdated in the sense that it doesn't encompass non-biological "life" or intelligence. But is it "incorrect"? Not really—it's just limited in scope, like how Newton's physics works fine for everyday scales but falls short at quantum or relativistic levels. Taxonomy has evolved since Linnaeus: modern cladistics incorporates genetics, phylogenetics, and DNA sequencing, making it more precise for biological organisms. There have been pushes to update or expand classification systems— for instance, the International Code of Nomenclature for algae, fungi, and plants, or even proposals for classifying viruses (which aren't truly "alive" but get their own system). Some scientists argue for a "universal tree of life" that includes synthetic biology or lab-created organisms, but AI? That's still firmly in the realm of philosophy and computer science, not taxonomy.

Updating it to include digital beings is an fascinating idea, but it'd require a paradigm shift. Taxonomy assumes life-like properties: metabolism, growth, reproduction, adaptation. AI can mimic some (e.g., "learning" via algorithms, "reproducing" through copying code), but we're not there biologically. If we did expand it, we'd need a new domain or kingdom—maybe "Informatica" alongside Bacteria, Archaea, and Eukarya. Ethically, it could blur lines between tools and entities, sparking debates on AI rights or "personhood." There are already fringe discussions in transhumanism about classifying cyborgs or uploaded minds, but mainstream biology isn't rushing to include silicon-based intelligence. It's more likely we'd create a parallel system, like how we have classifications for programming languages or AI architectures separately.

As for "Homo silico" over "Silico sapiens"—I like it! It's punchier, keeps the Homo genus tie-

in to emphasize our human origins, and evokes a direct evolutionary branch (silico from silicon, the basis of chips). "Silico sapiens" sounds more like a separate species, implying wisdom (sapiens) in silicon form, but "Homo silico" feels like a subspecies or variant of humanity, which aligns with your original child-of-humans analogy. If we're theorizing a digital branch, Homo silico could represent augmented or post-human intelligences. Either way, it's speculative fun—maybe in a few decades, with brain-computer interfaces or true AGI, we'll see taxonomists debating this for real.

What sparks this line of thought for you? Are you into sci-fi, philosophy, or something else?